



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

In a discourse pronounced several years ago at Chicago I offered public thanks to Mr. WILLIAM JAMES for his indulgent estimate of the desultory mind, not simply in behalf of Pindar but for a more intimate reason, hoping that others, similarly afflicted, would have recourse to the same wise and sympathetic physician. To be assured that one's mind is not necessarily out of order because the intermissions are longer than usual, and that one's clock is not necessarily a defective machine because there is a long interval between ticks cannot fail to soothe many an introspective and self-distrustful soul. But as I confide this new confession to *Brief Mention*, the figure I have used reminds me that the inveterateness of my tropical language, which has given so much offence to some of my syntactical colleagues, is not without a show of justification. At all events I have derived no small comfort from M. DE GOURMONT's spirited defence of the *style concret*.¹ In fact, I believe in spite of Mr. HOUSMAN (A. J. P. XXIX 124) that metaphor often answers the purpose much better than definition. All language is ultimately concrete and the resort to the concrete often makes matters clearer. M. BRÉAL identifies *finis* and *funis*, and it would be a joy to me if some one would prove that *πεῖρα*, about which the late F. D. ALLEN wrote an interesting paper in the Harvard Studies (IV 165), has not two meanings but simply one, and that the controversy about 'end' and 'rope' could be settled in favor of 'rope'—at once the most primitive and the most persistent form of limitation. There is no better definition of definition itself than 'roping off'. All this is *à propos* of my amusement at the emergence of an old figure, and the prodigious ado that has been made of late years about 'punktuell' in the definition of the interminable aorist. 'Punktuell' has been widely recognized as meeting the needs of the situation. But alas!—as we say in book English—'punktuell' is German and defies translation. One scholar has suggested and actually dared to use 'punctiliar', after the analogy of 'punctilious'. Why not 'punctuous', after the analogy of 'unctuous'? Why not resort to Greek and speak of the

¹ La faculté maîtresse du style, c'est la mémoire visuelle. Sans la mémoire visuelle, sans ce réservoir d'images où puise l'imagination pour de nouvelles et infinies combinaisons, pas de style, pas de création artistique. Elle seule permet, non seulement de peindre au moyen de figures verbales les divers mouvements de la vie mais de transformer aussitôt en visions toute association de mots, toute métaphore usée, tout mot isolé même, de donner en somme la vie à la mort. Voltaire, type banal de l'écrivain abstrait est certainement un visuel (A. J. P. XXIX 125). Remy de Gourmont, Le Problème du Style.

'stigmatic' aorist as one speaks of the 'sigmatic' aorist? The bodily transfer of German words to English is offensive by the very reason of the kinship of the two languages. We miss the necessary 'forshoving'. So I should far prefer 'metaphonesis' to 'Umlaut' and 'apophonesis' to 'Ablaut.' But I am solitary in my preferences. The real point, however, is the scientific triumph of a metaphor which has been familiar to me in the school room since the days when I learned the Greek alphabet and noted the resemblance of Φ to the astral lamp of the period. I leave to others the task of tracing the metaphor to its source and ascertaining the name of the desperate teacher who resorted to the 'point' for the aorist and the 'line' for the imperfect, with a ferule for an object lesson. Look at this ferule lengthwise. It is an imperfect. Endwise, it is an aorist. It is the same action from different points of view. And likely as not, the next day the forgotten metaphor was enforced by the same instrument that served to illustrate it. It must be nearer seventy than sixty years since that wonderful figure was impressed upon me. It is set forth at length in Crosby's Greek Grammar, a manual that had a certain vogue in its day, the first edition of which appeared in 1841. Why anybody should claim any credit for 'punktuell' passes my understanding. It is associated in my memory with the cheerful hymn:

A point of time, a moment's space,
Removes us to yon heavenly place
Or shuts us up in hell. (*Ἄτιδι ποταψεν*).

Professor BENJAMIN WILLIAM SMITH'S *Der vorchristliche Jesus* (Gieszen, Alfred Töpelmann) has been made the subject of a more or less elaborate review by W. SOLTAU in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* for June 1, 1907. The time has gone by when a review by a foreign writer was a passport to American immortality but, beyond a doubt, in the widespread and profound ignorance of English on the part of German classical scholars, which I have had occasion to note more than once (e. g., A. J. P. XV 398, XIX 464), a translation into German, however brought about (A. J. P. XIX 112), does much to enhance, perhaps to establish the reputation of an American author. But to imitate SOLTAU and discuss Professor SMITH'S book at length, or even to give an account of its drift, would be to turn the Journal into what I have called elsewhere 'the powder magazine of a theological review', and I will not undertake to do more than make a few remarks of the *vita senis* order. One shoulders one's crutch and shows how fields were lost, and the chapter in which Professor SMITH argues that Justin Martyr had no acquaintance with St. Paul's writings recalls to my mind an ancient grievance, which has long since passed into the category of amusing reminiscences.

When the late Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF was getting up his edition of *Herzog's Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*, he invited me as the sole American editor, I will not say student of Justin to contribute an article on the Martyr. The only reward held out was the opportunity of making my edition known to the readers of the Encyclopaedia. Somehow the invitation did not allure me and the scholar who undertook the article made no mention of my contribution to the literature of the subject. Indeed, an evil star seems to have presided over the birth of that book. To be sure, I had no right to complain because my friend, Mr. Joseph W. Harper, refused to entertain my proposal to issue a poster with the heading JUST OUT JUST IN, but there was a somewhat unusual succession of mishaps. Shortly after the book was published, Mr. Douglass, the financial backer of the 'Series of Christian Greek and Latin Writers' (A. J. P. XXV 484), went into bankruptcy. In the Harper's Catalogue the sins of my Justin Martyr were saddled on Professor March, the editor in chief of the series, and my *honorarium* or at least that part of it not spent in the purchase of the necessary books was swallowed up in a bank failure, so that the only comfort I have ever had out of the book was the use of it as a 'glory hole' for my syntactical formulae, so that I might not be forced to make obeisance to those who should appropriate without acknowledgment the result of my investigations (A. J. P. XVII 391, XX 354). In the same egotistical spirit I did not fail to refer to the book in the articles I contributed to the seventh edition of Liddell and Scott, all which references were promptly and properly expunged by the editors.

Not a very rich reward this for spending the leisure of two or three years with a lot of shabby Christians instead of roaming the fields of classical literature in company with a band of unregenerate but genial heathens. For I took my task seriously and read all the cognate literature from the beginning down to Justin and beyond, and, as I said in my preface, all my citations were at first hand unless distinctly credited. But the ban of Dr. Schaff was upon me and for aught that appears in the text of *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, my own countryman, Professor SMITH, who has sought to find fit audience on the other side by having his book translated, has not deigned to refer to my note on Justin, Apol. I 19, which is not taken from Otto, the well-known editor of Justin, who, by the way, thought well enough of my edition of the *Epistle to Diognetus* to follow it, and cite it here and there. This is my note on the passage—

ἀφθαρσίαν ἐνδύσασθαι. A Pauline reminiscence (?). Comp. I Cor. 15, 53: δεῖ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν. That it is not a mere coincidence would appear from Athenag. Res. 18, 68: δεῖ κατὰ τὸν ἀποστολὸν τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν. Comp. Tatian, c. 20; Theophil. ad Autolyc. 1, 7; Origen c. Cels. 7, 32.

Of course, I have no grudge against a man who is engaged in a tooth and nail struggle with Zahn for declining to consult an out-of-date edition of Justin, and the point involved is one of such slight importance in Professor SMITH's eyes that he dismisses it in the following contemptuous fashion (S. 210).

Nur ist daran zu erinnern dass kaum ein Sprachgebrauch unter den Alten allgemeiner und verbreiteter war als diese Metapher von anziehen (induo, ἐνδύω, labaš): Der Hebräer, der Araber, der Grieche, der Römer, "zieht" fast jedes Ding "an"; Kraft, Schwäche, u. s. w., u. s. w. Der Satz des Justin braucht darum nicht auf den Korintherbrief, sondern nur auf den allgemeinen Sprachgebrauch zurückzugreifen.

But κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον ought to have given him pause and might have given him pause, if he had shown the same consideration to American work as he desires American scholars to show to his. Nor can I agree with him in thinking the point of so little importance. The figure is common enough, but the combination is striking. 'Clothed with thunder' would at once be credited to Job (A. V.) and 'clothed with love' to Tennyson. 'Why lingereth she to clothe her heart with love?'. Why not ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν to St. Paul?

Statistical syntax took its rise for me many years ago in the memorable paper of LUDWIG LANGE, *Andeutungen über Ziel u. Methode der syntaktischen Forschungen*, 1853, but my first published article belongs to the year 1876, and in most of the statistical work in which I have been involved my part has been largely that of an accessory before the fact. One of these statistical studies, The Imperfect in Pindar, in which my figures had the advantage of Professor MILLER's exact revision, appeared in the fourth volume of the Journal (158-165) and, as it is perhaps the most neglected of my syntactical lucubrations, it has naturally been one of my favorites. In this article I applied the statistical method to the narrative portion of Pindar in order to ascertain the range of imperfect and aorist in what were then called the dactylo-epitrite and logaoedic odes, with the result that on the whole there are proportionally more aorists in the lighter than in the graver metres (see my Pindar I. E. ciii), a result quite in line with the fluctuations of quantity in the Pindaric poems as ascertained by Breyer (A. J. P. XIII 385). In my comment on this result I accepted the tradition that the aorist was necessarily the dominant tense in the narrative. But the statistical researches of the last twenty-five years have made it necessary to revise current statements and I may refer to my remarks in A. J. P. XIV 104, XVI 259 and especially to Professor MILLER's article on the Imperfect (XVI 139 foll.), in which he has reviewed Hultsch's laborious study of the Imperfect and Aorist in Polybios and has made an important contribution to the statistics of usage in other ranges of Greek literature. The imperfect divides the crown with the aorist in different proportions at different times and in different

spheres. Indeed, there are those who have claimed for the epos the predominance of the imperfect, which, being quite in keeping with the descriptive character of that sphere of poetry, is too seductive not to find ready acceptance in the absence of definite figures.

Mere counting, however, will not settle such questions. There are imperfects, some of them of frequent occurrence, that are simple preterites. The aorist of ἦν is ἐγένετο (A. J. P. XXVII 234),¹ but is ἦν always an imperfect? In the absence of an imperfect to ἐρχομαι, ἦσαν is predominantly imperfect. Is it always so, as Stahl has recently maintained? Are ἐφην and ἐφάμην always on the same line? Then there are pluperfects that are virtually imperfects. There are aorists that are practically perfects; and, while we are counting, we cannot fairly omit durative and aoristic tenses of the moods, the 'side moods' which are quite as 'paratatic' and 'apobatic' (A. J. P. XXIII 106) as the tenses of the indicative. We have, indeed, no right to accept and expound the traditional differences between ἐφενγον and ἐφυγον and pass over lightly or ignore the difference between φεύγειν and φυγεῖν as some have done. ἐφενγον differs from ἐφυγον only as φεύγειν differs from φυγεῖν. No exhaustive study can afford to neglect the 'kind of time' (A. J. P. XXII 350, XXVIII 110), nor was it neglected in the little article to which I have referred. But the conclusion reached, after all, was that the indicative gives the main lines and the other moods the shading, so that the study of the indicatives alone is justifiable—a conclusion which does not seem to me quite so certain now as it did then.

There are other things in that little paper, but I am not a resurrectionist of buried articles, and gladly turn to welcome a study that has recently appeared in the *Indogermanische Forschungen* XXII (1908) 202 fgg. by L. SCHLACHTER, entitled *Statistische Untersuchungen über den Gebrauch der Tempora u. Modi bei einzelnen griechischen Schriftstellern*. In this instalment the author deals with Homer. The next will discuss Herodotos.

I will not undertake to reproduce the formidable statistical tables, but will content myself with giving the main results which are sufficiently interesting. The First Part gives a statistic of all the verb forms of Iliad and Odyssey, arranged according to tenses and moods, followed by a table showing the relative representation of the different moods. The percentages in the two poems are:

	Ind.	Subj.	Opt.	Imp.	Inf.	Part.
Il.	57.5	5	3.1	3.9	8.9	21.7
Od.	56.8	4.8	4.2	3.8	8.8	21.3

a marvellous agreement. The only difference between Iliad and Odyssey worth noticing is the greater percentage of the opt. in the

¹ Where, l. 40, for Eccl. 277 read 177.

Odyssey, which SCHLACHTER does not undertake to explain. The potential opt. is more numerous in the Odyssey than in the Iliad and as the home of the potential opt. is in the speech, and the speeches in the Odyssey are to the speeches in the Iliad, according to MAX SCHNEIDEWIN'S count (*Jahrb.* 1884, S. 130), as 56:44, there is something but not much to be said on that score. A comparison of the modal proportions in other ranges of literature brings Iliad and Odyssey into the immediate neighborhood of the synoptic gospels, showing, according to SCHLACHTER, that the close agreement between Iliad and Odyssey is no proof of a common authorship. It is only a stereotype expression of a common sphere. But while the modal structure of the Iliad as a whole corresponds almost perfectly to the modal structure of the Odyssey, with the exception of the opt. as stated, the moods have a different share quantitatively in the tenses. Pres. subj. and opt. fall behind aor. subj. and opt. The participles run the other way. And finally all the moods do not bring out with equal sharpness the temporal relations of their forms.

The Second Part is summarized thus:

(1) In both poems the aorists of the indicative are considerably more numerous than the imperfects.

(2) In the Iliad still greater preference is shown to the aor. indicative.

(3) In the extra-indicative moods, the 'side-moods', this preference of the aorist extends only to the subj. and opt.

(4) In imperative, infinitive and participle, the durative ('paratactic') expression is more common.

(5) These excesses, the excess of aorist subj. and opt., the excess of present imperative, infin., and participle are relatively greater in the Iliad than in the Odyssey.

(6) In aor. subj. and opt. the asigmatic formations preponderate.

(7) In the epic dialect the aor. pass. is not yet fully assimilated in its function to the other aorist formations. The Odyssey marks an advance in this respect.

(8) The different aorist forms have a different share in the different moods, but in both epics the differences coincide.

Comment on the statistics from which these conclusions have been derived would require a special paper. Not the least interesting is the table in which SCHLACHTER has combined his results with Professor MILLER'S and from which it appears that the use of the aor. ind. gradually diminishes until it finds its low water mark in Xenophon. Then the aorist thrusts itself more and more to the front until it culminates in the N. T. The pseudo-naïveté of Xenophon suggests an answer to one problem. The Hellenica has the lowest percentage of imperfects, but it mounts up in the novellistic *Kyrupaideia*. The other problem, the very low percentage of the imperf. in the N. T.—e. g., Matth.

13 per cent., Apoc. 7—SCHLACHTER approaches gingerly, and well he may. It stands in marked contrast to Josephus, whose 46 per c. of imperfects shows the artificiality of his style, somewhat as does his use of the participles (A. J. P. IX 154), which, according to SCHLACHTER, he uses more than thrice as often as St. John's Gospel (41 : 12). This predominance of the aor. ind. can hardly be dissociated from the predominance of the aor. imperative in the N. T. (Justin Martyr, Apol. I 16, 6), although the predominance of the aor. imper. has a psychological basis which cannot be made out so readily for the aor. indic. Besides, we have to take into consideration the growth of the perfect and the familiar use of the historical present, which is kept down in St. Luke alone (A. J. P. XX 109, XXVII 328). There is another question—the preference given to the aor. subj. and opt. in Homer. Note that subj. and opt. are largely used in temporal sentences and the aorist suggests priority. Note also that in Pindar the generic conditional splits into pres. ind. and aor. subj. (I. E. cvii).

C. W. E. M.: SCHLACHTER's theory (pp. 236–8) that the predominance in Homer of the aorist subjunctive and optative over the present is due to the lack of differentiation, at the formative period of those poems, between present and second aorist stems, is ingenious but nothing more. The difference is inherent in the nature of the constructions. At all events a specimen book of the Iliad has yielded, with rare exceptions, just the typical 'paratatic' and 'apobatic' uses, and a specimen construction such as that of the final sentence confirms my judgment. According to SCHLACHTER, the entire number of present and aorist subjunctives and optatives in Homer is 3347, and of these forms, according to WEBER, Absichtssätze, pp. 27–32, 556, or about one sixth, belong to the final sentence. The distribution is as follows:

All Constructions.					Final Sentence.				Eliminating Final Sentence.				
	Aorist.		Present.		Aorist.		Present.		Aorist.		Present.		
	No.	%	%	No.	No.	%	%	No.	No.	%	%	No.	
Il.	{ Subj.	725	68	32	340	135	70	30	58	590	68	32	282
	{ Opt.	430	63	37	254	40	56	44	31	390	64	36	223
	{ Total.	1155	66	34	594	175	66	34	89	980	66	34	505
Od.	{ Subj.	556	65	35	293	133	68	32	63	423	65	35	230
	{ Opt.	473	63	37	276	64	67	33	32	409	63	37	244
	{ Total.	1029	64	36	569	197	67	33	95	832	64	36	474
Grand Total.		2184	65	35	1163	372	67	33	184	1812	65	35	979

Except in the case of the optative in the Iliad, the large preponderance of the aorist over the present is about the same for the final sentence as for the total subjunctive and optative constructions, and when the final sentence is eliminated, the remaining forms show practically the same ratios, indicating a similar average preponderance of the aorist over the present, so that conclusions may be drawn as to the general behavior of the other sentences from the behavior of the final sentence shown in the following table based upon WEBER'S statistics, *l. c.*:

Iliad.												Odyssey.												Total Number.
Subjunctive.				Optative.				Subjunctive.				Optative.												
Aorist.		Present.		Aorist.		Present.		Aorist.		Present.		Aorist.		Present.										
No.	%	%	No.	No.	%	%	No.	No.	%	%	No.	No.	%	%	No.									
μη	37	92.5	7.5	3	13	87	13	2	35	83	17	7	9	75	25	3	109							
ως	15	68	32	7	4	57	43	3	6	37.5	62.5	10	10	71	29	4	59							
δφρα	56	63	37	33	11	48	52	12	59	66	34	31	18	64	36	10	230							
iva	27	64	36	15	10	43	57	13	32	68	32	15	19	59	41	13	144							
επως	0	0	0	0	2	67	33	1	1	100	0	0	4	80	20	1	9							
εως	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	80	20	1	5							
Total.	135	70	30	58	40	56	44	31	133	68	32	63	64	67	33	32	556							

μη, because of the affinity of the negative for the aorist, exhibits the greatest disproportion between aorist and present. δφρα, which is really a temporal particle of limit, naturally shows a decided preference for the aorist. Though ιva slightly exceeds δφρα in the use of the aorist subjunctive, yet it falls below it in the aorist optative in both the Iliad and the Odyssey. ως shows even greater fluctuations. Now, if SCHLACHTER'S theory were correct, substantial uniformity in tense usage of the various final particles would be inevitable. As this uniformity does not exist in the final sentence, the inference lies near that it does not exist outside of the final sentence, and as there can be no doubt as to the presence of tense-distinctions in the one kind of sentence, there is every reason to believe that there was no lack of discrimination in the others.

Whenever Goethe, wisest of the sons of men, was in trouble, love or other, he wrote a poem about it, or a book about it, and hey presto! the trouble was gone. 'Gab mir ein Gott zu sagen wie ich leide' is the poetical version of a practical remedy. Now Goethe was the guide of my youth and I have followed his example afar off, though not necessarily for publication. Still one sorrow I do confide to my little circle of readers, and that is the grievance of typographical blunders. That is the special

messenger of Satan sent to buffet me, and if I can catch such an imp and make an example of him, put him to an open shame, I am much more comfortable; so that my confessions in the Journal are perhaps, after all, not so purely matters of philological conscience as I have sometimes represented them to be. To be sure, there are those who say that in view of the character of the Journal the errors of the press are few and slight. βαῖα μὲν ἀλλὰ—σκόροδα, and their odor haunts me. βαῖα recalls καταβαίων for καταβαίνων in the last number (p. 122, l. 14). For Epidamus (p. 98, footn. l. 2) read Epidaurus; p. 35, l. 8, for 'what' read 'that', 'we know *that* we see' and p. 125, l. 24 for 231 read 239.

FRANZ BUECHELER, JUNE 3, 1837—MAY 3, 1908.

I never heard Buecheler lecture except once, and that was in the summer of 1880. The profound impression that lecture made on me is recorded in my *Essays and Studies*, p. 507. No name is given there, and I have been asked more than once whom I meant. As a manner of tribute to the great scholar, so suddenly called from life, I subjoin the passage here in lieu of a more elaborate expression of the sense of loss I share with the world of classical scholars.

Some years ago I attended a lecture by a great master. The theme was the vanishing of weak vowels in Latin. Candor compels me to state that although I pride myself on being interested in the most uninteresting things, I should have chosen another subject for a specimen lecture. * * * I was much struck with the tone in which he announced his subject. It was the tone of a man who had seen the elements melt with fervent heat and the weak vowels vanish at the sound of the last trump. The tone, indeed, seemed entirely too pathetic for the occasion, but as he went on and marshalled the facts and set in order the long lines that connected the disappearance of the vowel with the downfall of a nationality, and great linguistic, great moral, great historical laws marched in stately procession before the vision of the student, the airy vowels that had flitted into the Nowhere seemed to be the lost soul of Roman life; and the Latin language, Roman literature and Roman history were clothed with a new meaning.

And as I copy these lines I recall what LEWIS said of our American Latinist LANE's 'instinctive and indomitable habit of linking the whole with every detail; of finding analogies between the dust and the stars of thought; of illuminating and ennobling what seemed trifling by side-lights from high places' (A. J. P. XVIII 371). There is no higher type of the scholar.